

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

February 12, 1980

AM

10:00

CONVENE, 708 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C.

I. ADMINISTRATION

- A. Dates of next meetings: March 11, 1980
April 8, 1980
- B. Approval of January 8, 1980 minutes.
- C. D.C. Bill 3 - 145, Bus Shelter Act of 1979, status.
- D. Rosslyn Skyline litigation; status report.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

- A. D.C. Board of Condemnation. Request for review of 1220, 1222, 1226 31st Street, N.W. (Hamilton Arms).
- B. D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development
 - 1. Old Georgetown Act
 - a. O.G. 80-26, 35th and Reservoir Road, N.W. Convent Garderns Corp. new houses, preliminary designs, design development approval.
 - b. O.G. 80-31 & 32, 2929 M Street, N.W. Conceptual review. Demolition of gas station. Proposed new bank building, proposed temporary banking facility.
 - 2. Shipstead-Luce Act
 - a. S.L. 80-14, 740 15th Street, N.W. Add two pent-house floors to existing bank building.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act Continued

- b. S.L. 80-16, 2217 N Street, N.W. Build a new apartment building.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 12/FEB/80 - 2, Improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue between 10th and 13th Streets, N.W. including Franklin Plaza in front of the Old Post Office Building.
2. CFA 12/FEB/80 - 3, Addition of flags to Pennsylvania Avenue frontage of the FBI Building, 9th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

D. Office of Management and Budget

1. CFA 12/FEB/80 - 1, Request comments on S.J. Resolution 119, "To authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund to erect a memorial."

E. Department of Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA 12/FEB/80 - 4, Hubert H. Humphrey Medal, revised design.

F. D.C. Department of Housing and Community Development

1. CFA 12/FEB/80 - 5, Proposed new development. Gallery Place, 7th and G Streets, N.W.

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

February 12, 1980

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 80-11 HPA. 80-112	3323 Q Street, N.W. Lawrence E. Cantrell	Aluminum siding over wood on front and over stucco on left side of building.
ACTION: This project was reviewed informally on January 22, 1980 by the Georgetown Board. No formal action will be made. Previous Board action stands final as "do not issue permit."		
O.G. 80-14 HPA. 80-135	3031 K Street, N.W. Nathan Landow	Multi-use complex. Residential-retail-garage
ACTION: Do not issue permit. See transmittal letter addressed to Robert L. Moore.		
O.G. 80-18 HPA. 80-147	3231 Volta Place, N.W. Leon Dreps	Addition to House of 1 bedroom, completely renovate existing structure adding 1/2 bath, all new plumbing electric and legal height basement.
ACTION: Issue permit for renovation and rear extension. No objection to proposed work as it is not visible from public space.		
O.G. 80-19 HPA. 80-150	Rear 1073 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Blues Alley	Construct front entrance door as per plans.
ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to entrance door as per plan.		
O.G. 80-20 HPA. 80-153	1010 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Safer, Davison & Associates	Exterior parking sign.
ACTION: Issue permit		

REPORT OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE OLD GEORGETOWN ACT

February 12, 1980

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
O.G. 80-23 HPA. 80-164	3137 M Street, N.W. Unisex Haircutters	Install 1 D/F wood panel 3' x 6" x 3' x 6" panel to be supported on channels 3 sides with steel scrolls at top and bottom, copy to be painted.
ACTION: Issue permit.		
O.G. 80-24 HPA. 80-165	1519 35th Street, N.W. Mary Jean Evans	Add 2 story addition on rear between adjoining two dwellings (party walls), not visible from public streets.
ACTION: Not visible from public space.		
O.G. 80-25 HPA. 80-167	1049 30th Street, N.W. James Place at Georgetown	Enclose walkway south end of building on first floor.
ACTION: Issue permit. No objection to closing walkway.		
O.G. 80-27 HPA. 80-171	1001 34th Street, N.W. Canal Mews Associates	Construct apartment building and garage.
ACTION: Issue permit. Request mock-up of material selection on the site and submission of manufacturers data on window products and colors.		
O.G. 80-30 HPA. 80-190	2823 N Street, N.W. Dr. Tom Bryant	Install new 30' x 15' pool inside yard, privacy fence around pool 5' high. Make opening in existing stone wall enlarge existing stone steps.
ACTION: Issue permit. Recommend restoration of existing cast iron fencing.		

REVIEW OF ACTIONS TAKEN UNDER THE SHIPSTEAD-LUCE ACT

February 12, 1980

<u>NO.</u>	<u>ADDRESS AND OWNER</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>
S.L. 80-15	2922 Cortland Place, N.W. William Thompson	Remove interior partition, install exterior door and window as shown on plans.

ACTION: Issue permit.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

J. CARTER BROWN, Chairman

PHILIP W. BUCHEN

FREDERICK D. NICHOLS

VICTORINE DU PONT HOMSEY

KEVIN ROCHE

ELI S. JACOBS

EDWARD D. STONE, JR.

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

708 JACKSON PLACE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
202-566-1066

MINUTES OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 February 1980

The meeting was convened at 10:10 a.m. in the Commission of Fine Arts offices at 708 Jackson Place, N. W., Washington, D. C.

Members Present:

Hon. J. Carter Brown, Chairman
Hon. Philip W. Buchen
Hon. Victorine DuPont Homsey
Hon. Eli S. Jacobs
Hon. Frederick D. Nichols

Georgetown Board

Member Present:

Mr. Theodore Sande

Staff Present:

Mr. Charles H. Atherton, Secretary
Mr. Donald B. Myer, Assistant Secretary
Mrs. Maureen Gormley
Mrs. Sue Kohler

Historic Preservation Office

Member Present:

Mrs. Tanya Beauchamp

I. ADMINISTRATION

A. Dates of next meetings, approved as: 11 March 1980
8 April 1980

B. Minutes of 8 January 1980 meeting, approved.

C. D. C. Bill 3-145, Bus Shelter Act of 1979, status. The Secretary reported that this bill received its second reading recently before the City Council and will probably be passed. It would provide for shelters to be erected in non-residential areas by private firms and financed by advertising placed on the end panels. In view of the Commission's previous opposition to the bill, the Secretary asked the members if they wished to send a letter to the Mayor urging his veto

and/or to the Congressional Oversight committees stating the Commission's opposition. He added that in the event the bill does become law, the Commission could at least try to work with the Mayor in determining the location of these shelters.

The members all agreed that a strong stand should be taken, although Mr. Jacobs questioned whether the Commission could take a stand on areas outside its jurisdiction. The Secretary replied that there is ample precedent for this in the actions the Commission has taken regarding such items as street trees, street lights and signs in public space throughout the city. Mr. Buchen did not think there would be a problem, especially as the shelters would certainly be proposed for some locations within the Commission's jurisdiction.

D. Rosslyn Skyline litigation; status report. The Secretary reported that this litigation will not be pursued at the Supreme Court level. He added, however, that one encouraging result of the suit has been a request by the Arlington County Planning Commission for the Commission of Fine Arts' cooperation in the planning of future projects.

II. SUBMISSIONS AND REVIEWS

A. D. C. Board of Condemnation. Request for review of 1220, 1222, and 1226 31st Street, N. W. (Hamilton Arms) The Secretary told the members that the Board of Condemnation had notified him in January of a hearing to be conducted at the end of the month regarding the possible condemnation of these three frame and stucco houses. At this hearing the Secretary submitted a letter outlining the Commission's position that every effort should be made to retain these historic, small scale structures, and asking that a final decision by the Board be delayed until the Commission could review any new evidence regarding their condition. A hearing was set for 27 February so that reports by both the owner's and the tenants' structural engineers could be prepared, and the Commission was asked to report on what it would consider acceptable in the way of reconstruction and demolition, should this be necessary.

The Secretary also reported that several days after the January hearing, two other structures on the property, the kiln and its chimney, were demolished, having been declared unsafe by the city.

The Chairman observed that the houses will never look the same if they are totally reconstructed rather than restored, but if it is determined that they must be demolished, the Commission would watch the character of the replacement very carefully.

The architect, Richard Stauffer, was then introduced. He said the city engineer has told him that the houses must come down because deterioration has gone too far. He showed the members a sketch of the houses as they would appear after reconstruction. He said he intends to rebuild them with clapboard fronts, rather than stucco, as they appear in an old photograph.

The members all agreed that in the report to the Condemnation Board, their previous action, as stated in the letter submitted by the Secretary, should be strongly reaffirmed, with the additional observation that if the houses cannot be retained, the Commission would expect the replacement to duplicate the existing in scale, character and materials.

B. D. C. Department of Housing and Community Development

1. Old Georgetown Act

a. O.G. 80-26, 35th and Reservoir Road, N. W. Convent Gardens Corporation, new houses, preliminary designs, design development approval. The Assistant Secretary reviewed this project, reminding the members that they had approved the preliminary site plan previously and saying that this submission was for review of the general streetscape approach being taken. He said the Georgetown Board had seen the drawings and suggested some minor architectural changes, but in general thought the design was proceeding in the right direction.

The developer, James Donohoe, and the architect, Alan Lockman, were both present and affirmed that the purpose of this submission was to get the Commission's reaction to their preliminary facade designs for the individual houses so that they could proceed with more detailed drawings.

Theodore Sande of the Georgetown Board said that earlier versions had shown too much variation in design from house to house, and the suggestion had been made to achieve variation through subtle changes of mortar color and brick texture, as can be seen in Georgian London, rather than using a variety of architectural elements. Mr. Sande thought the present version much improved, though he felt the facades which occur at the end of the rows still need some work. The Chairman and the other members agreed with this.

Grosvenor Chapman, architect, representing the Citizens' Association of Georgetown, said he was in agreement with the observations on the architectural details and only wanted to comment that this project exhibits a rather high density of development, with more

houses per acre than usual when the area devoted to streets is subtracted from the total square footage. Scott Ross, representing the developer, said that while this is true, it must be considered in relation to other facts. For example, the lot coverage will be only 40%, rather than the 60% allowed, and instead of the 179 houses allowed for the acreage, only 153 will be built. Mr. Donohoe added that the District Government has already reviewed and approved this aspect of the development. There were no further comments, and the preliminary facade designs were approved.

b. O.G. 80-31 & 32, 2929 M Street, N. W. Conceptual review. Demolition of gas station. Proposed new bank building, proposed temporary banking facility. The Assistant Secretary explained that there were two submissions before the Commission at this meeting: the conceptual design for the new bank and the request for the installation of a temporary banking facility on the site. The demolition request will be submitted later. He said the Georgetown Board has reviewed the project but saw a slightly different version of the new building than the one presented at this meeting. He introduced the architect, James Murphy, who discussed his design. He said he had considered three approaches. The first was to continue the row house type of development existing to the east and thus utilize the space to the fullest extent. This had been discarded because such a building would not give the bank (National Savings and Trust) any true identity in the neighborhood. The second approach, erection of a free-standing building in a contemporary style, had been ruled out because it would not be harmonious with the historic district. The third solution, the one adopted, was to erect a more traditional, but distinctive, building with ample space around it, which would give the bank the identity it desires.

Drawings showed a one story octagonal building with a cupola, joined to a smaller one story rectangular appendage by a connecting link. Mr. Murphy said these drawings reflected changes requested by the Georgetown Board; specifically, a lighter, more open porch type entrance, and a canopy design for the drive-in teller more harmonious with the rest of the building. He said the principal material would be a sand-finished Colonial brick, with slate for the roof and anodized aluminum (bronze colored) for the window frames. The cornice would be moulded brick. The temporary building will not be the mansard roof-aluminum siding structure the Georgetown Board had objected to, but would be more contemporary in design with a flat roof and simulated cast stone siding. The Commission was not happy with the appearance of this temporary structure as shown in the photographs of other installations. The Chairman asked if there is some compelling reason why the bank has to begin business before the permanent structure is completed; Mr. Murphy said that in view of the highly competitive nature of the banking business, National Savings and Trust (NS&T) is most anxious to become established on the site as soon as possible.

Turning to the new building, the Chairman remarked that although he thought it quite charming, its octagonal form is alien to the Georgetown tradition and might give the effect of a suburban intrusion on the block. He thought that continuing the typical Georgetown street frontage and filling in the volume of the lot would be more desirable. The identity sought by the bank could then be achieved by the treatment of the major banking space and some distinguishing element on the exterior.

Theodore Sande, representing the Georgetown Board, reported that the Board, too, had mixed feelings about this building. The members thought a pavilion might be justified in this spot as it would keep a little open space, the loss of which is so frequently lamented in Georgetown. The rectangular appendage was seen as being the most difficult element of the design, and it was suggested that the functions assigned to this portion--work room, vault, lounge, mechanical room--could be placed underground.

Mr. Sande commented generally on the stylistic derivation of the building and suggested that rather than going back to Wren, especially in regard to the cupola, Mr. Murphy might take his inspiration from NS&T's main office at 15th Street and New York Avenue, built in the 1880's.

Mr. Chapman said the Citizens' Association had spent a great deal of time discussing this project and was generally favorable. He said that he had, at first, thought it better to continue the row type development, but decided that it would be very difficult to equal such a fine row. He added that the pavilion type building does have the advantage of leaving some open space. Mr. Chapman said he had no objection to the rectangular appendage.

Ray Kukulski, representing the ANC, said his major concern is the drive-in facility and the possibility of cars queuing up on the street and disrupting traffic. He said the District DOT is also concerned about this. As for the design, he said he does not like it, but not being an expert in such matters would make no further comment.

Returning to the design, Mr. Murphy said his building would not be the only free-standing element on M Street, citing as an example the Old Stone House in the next block west. In regard to the treatment of the drive-in entrance, the Chairman suggested it might be possible to work out a design in which one would drive through an arch with usable space built above. He asked Mr. Murphy to work on some of the variations suggested and bring them first to the Georgetown Board and then to the Commission. He also asked that the Commission see some planting schemes. The conceptual design for the new building was not approved.

A vice president of NS&T was present at the meeting and was questioned by the Chairman about the need for a temporary banking facility. He said the bank considers it vital, and he fears approval for this branch might be withdrawn if banking cannot begin there in the very near future. The Chairman said the Commission is not at all enthusiastic about this type of structure but will allow it under the circumstances.

2. Shipstead-Luce Act

a. S.L. 80-14, 740 15th Street, N. W. Add two penthouse floors to existing bank building. The Assistant Secretary pointed out the location of this project on 15th Street, just east of Lafayette Square, and said the submission was for the addition of two office space penthouse floors on the Beaux-Arts style Union Trust building. He introduced the architect, Arthur Keyes, of Keyes, Condon and Florance, who noted that in addition to these penthouse floors for executive offices, the bank is also expanding into the courtyard of its building. He said there would be a few minor changes to the facade of the building to accommodate interior work and pointed these out on a drawing. Turning to the penthouse addition, Mr. Keyes said that while it will not be generally visible from the pedestrian level, it will be seen from some vantage points, especially diagonally across the street, and from the upper floors of buildings in the vicinity. He said they had tried to keep the penthouse as simple as possible, following the recommendations of the Landmarks Committee, and to recall the old facade in proportion and material. Granite or cast stone would be used for the piers, with the glass between a solar brown or grey framed in bronze-toned aluminum. Mr. Keyes said the design of the addition had been hampered by structural considerations involving the old foundations and by a projecting elevator penthouse which cannot be moved.

Mr. Nichols commented that the addition still seems to be a glass building on top of a masonry structure and suggested making the piers a little heavier. Mr. Keyes said this problem is still being studied, and the thought now is that a reveal around the window frames would give some depth and shade, making the addition look less like a contemporary structure without imitating the old.

The Chairman said the biggest problem will be the visibility of the corner of the penthouse addition from across the street, although he added that it would probably not be as noticeable as it appears in the elevation drawings.

There were no further questions and the design was approved.

b. S.L. 80-16, 2217 N Street, N. W. Build a new apartment building. The Assistant Secretary pointed out the site of the proposed building on a map, noting that the rear will be visible from the P Street bridge and the pedestrian walk in Rock Creek Park. He introduced the architect, Don Hawkins, who showed slides of the site and the existing buildings. Mr. Hawkins said the new building will replace two houses at the end of a Victorian row. It will extend 40 feet behind the rear of the row houses and in height will be somewhere between that of the houses and a larger apartment building next door. Underground parking will be provided. The Chairman, while not objecting to the design, thought an opportunity had been missed by not picking up some of the Victorian character of the row houses. Mr. Hawkins agreed, but said that because of the speculative nature of the development and the necessity for locating the garage entrance in the front, it had not been possible to do much along this line. As the Commission's responsibility is limited to advising on the effect of the building on Rock Creek Park and this was not considered to be adverse, the design was approved.

C. Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation

1. CFA 12/FEB/80-2, Improvements to Pennsylvania Avenue between 10th and 13th Streets, N. W. including Franklin Plaza in front of the Old Post Office building. The Secretary first introduced Thomas F. Murphy, new chairman of PADC, and Nathaniel Owings, vice chairman; he then introduced Charles Gueli, who discussed this submission. Mr. Gueli said PADC is now working on improvements to the sidewalks in the area from 13th to 10th Street, with special attention being given to the triangle in front of the Old Post Office. He introduced Russ Hanna from EDAW, design and planning consultants for this work, who recalled the three unusual sidewalk areas in this section of the avenue: one in front of the new office building now under construction at the northwest corner of 12th and Pennsylvania, the second in front of the Presidential building on the northeast corner, and the third and most important, the triangle in front of the Old Post Office. In addition to special treatment for this space, the statue of Benjamin Franklin, first Postmaster General, will be moved from its present location on 10th Street to this triangular area, which will be called the Old Post Office Plaza. With the help of the NEA, an artist has been selected to design this space. She is Alexandra Cassuba, whose field is creating mosaic-like patterns in stone or brick for wall and floor areas. Ms. Cassuba was present at the meeting and showed slides documenting the development of her style and illustrating a number of her recent commissions. She then discussed her impression of the Old Post Office as a heavy, static structure which seems to be sinking. The theory behind her design of the space in front is that it should visually "lift" the building. She said she has tried to relate to both the brownish-red PADC paving block and the grey granite of the building in her selection of color and material.

The design selected by PADC would be executed primarily in red brick and features a repetition of the form of the Post Office entrance arches, almost as if they are casting shadows. In front of the arch forms, bricks would be set in a wavy pattern stressing the diagonal of the street. While all agreed that this would be handsome, the Chairman asked if consideration had been given to the next to last version shown, predominantly grey in color, because it would echo the granite of the building instead of introducing so much red to the street, and because the pattern of the stones would draw the observer into the building rather than past it and down the diagonal of the avenue. The Post Office arches also appear in this version. Ms. Cassuba said the disadvantage of this design is that it would cost three times the budget, if executed in granite. The Chairman suggested that another less expensive grey stone might be used, or money for the granite might be found from other sources, perhaps from the NEA, which will have offices in the building. Mr. Owings said that the staff of PADC had also preferred this design before the cost factor came into it, and that he personally strongly favors this design and that the attempt should be made to find the necessary funds.

2. CFA 12/FEB/80-3, Addition of flags to Pennsylvania Avenue frontage of the FBI building, 9th and Pennsylvania Avenue, N. W. Mr. Gueli showed drawings of the FBI building with state flags hanging between the columns on the mezzanine (perpendicular to the facade) and U. S. flags placed in holders on the exterior face of the columns. The state flags would normally be recessed behind the facade but could be moved out for special occasions. In response to a question from Mrs. Homsey, Mr. Gueli said the U. S. flags would be historical versions (except for two at the entrance), not the regular flag repeated as a decorative element. Mr. Owings commented that thus far PADC has not been able to get shops into the first floor level of the building. Mr. Gueli said they are considering exhibit areas between the columns, or perhaps stores that project out, since they cannot penetrate the building.

There were no objections to the placing of the flags and the project was approved.

D. Office of Management and Budget

1. CFA 12/FEB/80-1, Request comments on S.J. Resolution 119, "To authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund to erect a memorial". The Secretary reported that unlike most legislation reviewed by the Commission, this mentions a specific site, Constitution Gardens, for the memorial. As this is not the approach preferred by the Commission, it was suggested that the transmittal letter point out that, while not precluding Constitution Gardens, the legislation should be more general regarding the site, thereby offering more assurance that both design and site would complement each other.

E. Department of the Treasury, Bureau of the Mint

1. CFA 12/FEB/80-4, Hubert H. Humphrey medal, revised design. The Secretary showed this revised version with a slight change in the position of the shoulders which eliminated the hunched effect objected to in the original design. The Chairman and Mrs. Homsey thought the letters still crowded the head, and the Secretary said he would convey this to the representative from the Mint. The revised design was approved.

EXHIBIT B, B-1

F. D. C. Department of Housing and Community Development

1. CFA 12/FEB/80-5, Proposed new development, Gallery Place, 7th and G Streets, N. W. The Assistant Secretary located the site on an aerial photograph, noting that it would face the Old Patent Office building (now housing the Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts) on 7th Street, with the Old Tarriff Commission building located diagonally across the street at 7th and F Streets. He introduced Stanley Sherman from the D. C. Government, who reviewed the history of the project, noting that five teams had submitted proposals, from which the one presently before the Commission had been selected by the RLA. The team is composed of Vlastimil Koubek associated with Bryant and Bryant, architects; and Hideo Sasaki, landscape architect.

Mr. Koubek discussed the design of the project. He said the proposed building, in a C-4 area, would include office, hotel and apartment space. It would be 130 feet in height, and there would be 600,000 square feet of office space, occupying the 2nd-6th floors, a 580 room hotel on top, with 200 apartments filling the upper six floors to the east. There would be five levels below grade, three for parking and two for support facilities for the hotel.

Mr. Koubek then discussed the exterior design, noting that massing had been an important and sensitive consideration. He said the building has now been set back 20 feet further on 7th Street than in the original submittal to RLA. There is a Metro easement at the 7th and G Street corner which precludes any structure there. The design provides for pedestrian walkways throughout the project and for two atria which widen as they go up; one would be roofed over with glass at the third floor level, the other at the eighth. Drawings showed penthouses 12-13 feet high; Mr. Koubek said they could perhaps be lowered somewhat. There would be balconies at the hotel and apartment floors, and the cornice line of the Old Patent Office and horizontality of the WMATA building to the east are reflected in the design. Mr. Koubek said the FAR is 9.1-9.2; the prospectus called for 9-13.

The Chairman commented that regardless of the comparatively low FAR and the ample amount of interior space provided by the atria, the envelope is overpowering and top heavy and appears to crush the Old Patent Office. He said that while he has no objection to dense urban development downtown, and does not object to the building coming right out to the street on three of the facades, the Commission feels that where it faces the classic Greek Patent Office great sensitivity is called for and some further stepping back must be done, even at the expense of sacrificing some of the interior open space. He said he found the overhang of the top stories particularly worrisome.

Hideo Sasaki, landscape architect, noted that because of the undercutting of the building at the lower levels and the openness provided by the pedestrian walkways and large expanses of glass, the Patent Office would actually be very visible to the pedestrian.

Mr. Bryant said the model exaggerates the top heavy aspect; from the street the relationship would appear quite different.

Mr. Nichols suggested that lessening the strong horizontal emphasis on the upper floors would help make the building appear smaller.

In summary, the Chairman said the Commission's primary objection to the building is its uneasy relationship to the Old Patent Office, particularly because of the projection of the upper floors on that side. He suggested moving this section back and establishing an implied cornice line at the height of the Patent Office cornice, so that the Greek portico of this building would still be the dominant focal point on the street. The design was not approved.

G. Appendices, approved.

Exhibit C

The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Signed,



Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

96TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

S. J. RES. 119

To authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc., to erect a memorial.

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 8 (legislative day, NOVEMBER 5), 1979

Mr. MATHIAS (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BAYH, Mr. NUNN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEINZ, Mr. INOUE, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GARN, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. BOREN, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. EXON, Mr. DeCONCINI, Mr. CRANSTON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. EAGLETON) introduced the following joint resolution; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration

JOINT RESOLUTION

To authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc., to
erect a memorial.

1 *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*
2 *of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc., a nonprofit
4 corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Dis-
5 trict of Columbia, is authorized to erect a memorial on public
6 grounds in West Potomac Park in the District of Columbia,

1 in honor and recognition of the men and women of the Armed
2 Forces of the United States who served in the Vietnam war.

3 SEC. 2. (a) As the site upon which may be erected the
4 memorial authorized in the first section of this resolution,
5 there is hereby designated a parcel of land of not less than
6 two acres in the area known as Constitution Gardens in
7 West Potomac Park in the District of Columbia, which parcel
8 the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Viet-
9 nam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc., is authorized and direct-
10 ed to select.

11 (b) The design and plans for such memorial shall be sub-
12 ject to the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts,
13 in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and the
14 National Capital Planning Commission.

15 (c) Other than as to the land authorized for the erection
16 of the memorial in subsection (a), neither the United States
17 nor the District of Columbia shall be put to any expense in
18 the erection of this memorial.

19 SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this resolu-
20 tion shall lapse unless the erection of such memorial is com-
21 menced within five years from the date of enactment of this
22 resolution.

23 SEC. 4. The maintenance and care of the memorial
24 erected under the provisions of this resolution shall be the
25 responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior.

February 22, 1980

Dear Mr. Peterson:

I am writing in reply to the request for the Commission's views on S.J. Res. 119, a bill that would authorize the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund Inc. to erect a memorial.

The Commission considered this legislation at its public meeting on February 12, 1980. While there were no objections to the concept of the proposed memorial, the Commission did take strong exception to the bill's provision specifying a specific site.

The Commission believes, as it has over many years, that it is inappropriate to designate a specific site for a memorial until more is known about its intended character. In addition, we are particularly concerned in this instance with a proposed memorial for Constitution Gardens, since the gardens were specially designed as an informal park where people could find a different sort of experience in contrast to adjoining memorial areas of the city. It is the Commission's belief that if Constitution Gardens is to become the setting for major memorials, and certainly the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is in this category, the intended character of the park will be seriously diminished, if not lost altogether.

The Commission is ready to look at the specific proposals, when they are ready, and is not in a position to rule out any possibility at this juncture. Meanwhile, however, it urges that any specific reference to a site be deleted from the legislation, and that the bill simply authorize the construction of a memorial in the District of Columbia or immediate environs.

The Commission pledges its earnest efforts to work with the National Park Service and other relevant authorities to find the

most appropriate and enhancing site for this important memorial.

Sincereely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mr. Ronald Peterson
Assistant Director
Legislative Reference
Office of Management & Budget
Washington, D. C. 20503

CHA:ko:hg

February 12, 1980

Dear Mr. White:

I understand that a question has arisen on the estimated cost of producing a marble bust of the late Hubert H. Humphrey that is to be placed with those of other Vice-Presidents at the Capitol. The work is to be executed by Walker Hancock for a fee of \$25,000.

As you probably know, there is little in the way of specific guidelines in the commissioning of works of art. So much depends on the ability of the artist and the nature of the work. This is especially true when the piece is to be sculpted in stone. Such a medium allows no margin for error and requires much skill in execution.

It would be difficult to evaluate the fee, in this case, since there would be factors such as time schedules, preliminary studies, the construction and design of a suitable base and so forth that I am unfamiliar with and which would affect the amount of the fee.

However, I believe that considering the significance of the proposed work, the importance of the place it is to be displayed, and the professional competence of the artist, the estimated fee appears to be reasonable.

Sincerely yours,

SIGNED

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
George White
Architect of the
Capitol
U.S. Capitol Building
Room SB 15
Washington, D.C. 20515

EXHIBIT B

February 22, 1980

Dear Mrs. Hackel:


The Commission of Fine Arts inspected the revised design of the Hubert Humphrey Medal at its meeting on February 12, 1980. We believe it is a great improvement over the original sketch.

One way it could be improved further would be to leave a little more space between the top of the head and the lower edge of lettering surrounding the circumference of the medal.

We discussed this problem with your representative at our meeting in January but unfortunately it was not mentioned in our letter to you. However, I hope making such a minor adjustment will be possible.

With all best wishes,

Sincerely yours,


J. Carter Brown
Chairman

Mrs. Stella Hackel, Director
Bureau of the Mint
501 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20220

CHA:KO:hg

EXHIBIT B-1

February 25, 1980

Dear Mr. Moore:

I am writing to report the Commission's views on the proposed development of Parcel Six, across from the Portrait Gallery on Seventh Street, which was considered at our meeting on February 12, 1980.

There are many good features to the proposal. The mixture of residential and hotel uses with commercial shops and offices should greatly add to the already growing vitality of the neighborhood. The Convention Center, the Seventh Street shops and art galleries, and the new development south of the Gallery and east near Judiciary Square will all benefit from the new activities and people.

The Commission, however, is deeply concerned about the massive character of the building, especially where it faces the old Patent Office Building which is one of the great architectural treasures of the capital. The Tariff Commission Building, another significant national landmark by the same early nineteenth century architect Robert Mills, is just across the corner to the southwest.

The problem with the development proposal lies as much in the area of design as it does in sheer building height. The upper stories which will be used for hotel accommodations are comprised of a uniform and unrelieved mass that projects beyond the face of the lower floors and supporting structure. This arrangement results in an exaggerated heaviness and severity to the facades and will, we believe, overwhelm the classical scale of the important landmarks across Seventh Street.

...2/

In reviewing the design, the Commission noted the extensive interior space occupied by the glazed atrium separating the upper hotel functions from the residential quarters on the east, and concluded that this atrium could be reduced somewhat in size so that the upper part of the Seventh Street facade could be moved back, lessening its impact on the landmark buildings. This could be accomplished without significantly reducing the number of hotel rooms, although some reduction in rooms would actually be beneficial to a project which has close to one million square feet of floor area, an amount considerably in excess of normal zoning standards. If this setting back of the upper mass could be accompanied by the modulation of the facades to further reduce the severity of the design, the architectural would be greatly improved.

The Gallery Place project is the first of what is expected to be a number of large scale developments in and around this important location in the downtown area. However, there are unique architectural and historic characteristics which set this particular neighborhood apart from others, and they should be respected and enhanced if their fullest potential contribution to the city is to be realized.

We will be happy to consider the matter further at the appropriate time.

Sincerely yours,

J. Carter Brown
Chairman

The Honorable
Robert L. Moore
Director
Government of the
District of Columbia
Department of Housing and
Community Development
1325 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

